

purview of Rumbolt, claim 11 was again amended to read "analyzing without operator invention," which represents the present wording of this claim. It is believed that this phrase does, in fact, distinguish the claim over the prior art without raising a 35 U.S.C. §112 issue as noted in the most recent Advisory Action. As discussed with the Examiner on April 13, given the long and detailed preamble associated with this method claim, the claim should be allowable. In the alternative, the Applicant requests that the Examiner suggest language so as to bring this claim, and those which depend from it, into condition for allowance, given the Applicant's diligence in attempting to do so thus far.

Any questions should be directed to the undersigned at (313) 662-0270.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posa
Reg. No. 37,424

Dated: 18 April '94

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231.

Date: 4/20/94


Sheryl L. Hammer

